



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/802,425	03/09/2001	Dean Rhodes	05309P001X	7222

8791 7590 02/12/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

CHOI, FRANK I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1616

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/802,425

Applicant(s)

RHOADES, DEAN

Examiner

Frank I Choi

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/13/2002, 6/6/2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7, 21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12.                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Examiner has duly considered Applicant's arguments but deems them moot in light of the new grounds of rejection herein.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election of Group I, Claims 1-7, 21 and 22 in Paper No. 11 (12/13/2002) is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 4,6,8-11,13 and 18-20 were cancelled, as such, claims 1-3,5,7,21,22 remain pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,21,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lee et al. (US Pat. 6,294,179)

Lee et al. expressly discloses a composition comprising calcite having particles sizes falling within the claimed range of 50 to 556 microns, surfactants, hectorite, xanthan gum and water falling within the scope of Applicant's claims (Column 5, Column 6, lines 1-20).

Alternatively, at the very least the claimed invention is rendered obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103, because the prior art discloses products and uses that contain the same exact ingredients/components as that of the claimed invention. See *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See also *In re May*, 197 USPQ 601, 607 (CCPA 1978).

Claims 1-3,5,7,21,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Saperstein (US Pat. 3,092,111) or Stiefel (US Pat. 4,957,747).

Saperstein expressly discloses a composition comprising aluminum oxide having particles sizes falling within the claimed range of 50 to 556 microns, surface-active agent, emollient and water falling within the scope of Applicant's claims (Column 6, lines 36-75, Column 7, Columns 13-16, claims 11,12).

Stiefel expressly discloses a composition comprising aluminum oxide having particles sizes falling within the claimed range of 50 to 556 microns, emollients, soap formers and water falling within the scope of Applicant's claims (Column 2, Examples 1,2).

Alternatively, at the very least the claimed invention is rendered obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103, because the prior art discloses products and uses that contain the same

Art Unit: 1616

exact ingredients/components as that of the claimed invention. See *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See also *In re May*, 197 USPQ 601, 607 (CCPA 1978).

Claims 1-3,5,7,21,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imamura et al. (US Pat. 4,284,533).

Imamura et al. teach a composition containing abrasives, such as aluminum oxide and magnesium oxide, wherein the particle size of the abrasive can range from 2 to 150 microns and larger, surfactants, hydrotropes, polyacrylic acid (Column 1, lines 65-68, Column 2, Column 3, lines 36-45).

The difference between the prior art and the claimed invention is that the prior art does not expressly disclose using abrasive particles in the range of 50 microns to 556 microns. However, the prior art amply suggests the same as it is known to use abrasive particles overlapping said range. As such, it would have been well within the skill of an ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the prior art as above depending on the desired abrasiveness of the composition.

Therefore, the claimed invention, as a whole, would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, because every element of the invention has been collectively taught by the combined teachings of the references.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1616

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3,5,7,21,22 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3,6-12 of copending Application No.09/411,712 in view of Lee et al. (US Pat. 6,294,179), Saperstein (US Pat. 3,092,111), Stiefel (US Pat. 4,957,747) OR Imamura et al. (US Pat. 4,284,533).

The claims of the copending application disclose compositions containing microcrystals of alumina. The difference between the claims of the copending application and the present application is that the copending application does not set forth the size range of the microcrystals. However, the prior art as set forth above and incorporated herein each teach sizes of particles that fall within the claimed range. As such, it would have been well within the skill of and one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the claims of said copending application to set forth particle sizes, including particle sizes within the claimed range, depending the abrasiveness of the composition desired.

Therefore, the claimed invention, as a whole, would have been an obvious variation of the claims of said copending application to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, because every element of the invention has been collectively taught by the combined teachings of the references.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Art Unit: 1616

***Conclusion***

A facsimile center has been established in Technology Center 1600. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 8:45 AM to 4:45 PM. The telecopier numbers for accessing the facsimile machines are (703) 308-4556 or (703) 305-3592.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank Choi whose telephone number is (703) 308-0067. Examiner maintains a flexible schedule. However, Examiner may generally be reached Monday-Friday, 8:00 am – 5:30 pm (EST), except the first Friday of the each biweek which is Examiner's normally scheduled day off.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Mr. José Dees, can be reached on (703) 308-4628. Additionally, Technology Center 1600's Receptionist and Customer Service can be reached at (703) 308-1235 and (703) 308-0198, respectively.

FIC

February 5, 2003



JOHN PAK  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1600

